



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,534	11/15/2001	Toshihiro Shima	TMI-108	7269

7590 01/27/2006

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SUITE 370
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KANG, ROBERT N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/987,534	Applicant(s) SHIMA, TOSHIHIRO	
	Examiner Robert N. Kang	Art Unit 2622	<i>RNK</i>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 11-19, 21-32, 34 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-10, 20, 33 and 36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

Response to Arguments

1. The applicants respond to the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. §112 by stating, "one having ordinary skill in the art would realize how to generate the print data with the printer network board or box that is disclosed by Applicants." Examiner must respectfully disagree. A host PC or cellular phone as disclosed in the application, not running a specific or virtual printer driver (as the Examiner assumes is the purpose of the invention) must run some sort of application to send print data to the IP address of the printer. While it may be obvious to one of normal skill to write a script to send raw (before raster information processing) text and image data through a specific transport protocol to a given network address whenever the "print" command from the system O/S is executed, this is only one of many possible solutions to the problem. Several possible solutions also exacerbate the very problem that the invention is attempting to solve, the reduction of required software installation and updates on the host device. Furthermore, merely suggesting that a solution is well known in the art does not enable the specification to carry out that function. Examiner feels that the specification lacks several components critical to the functionality of the invention, and is therefore non-enabling. The traversal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 is therefore rejected.\

2. Applicant's argument for withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-5 states, "the printer network board/box provides a printer with a network interface function and thus, is completely different from a WebTV client or a printer server, which provides a printer

with a hosting function.” Examiner feels this difference is semantic; momentarily disregarding the function of automatically updating and/or downloading the various printer drivers, the applicant’s invention receives raw data (image and text) and converts it to a data format usable by a plurality of printers. As indicated by Mr. Mattingly in a phone interview conducted 1/20/06, the “hosting function” refers to the fact that the client operating system is retained in WebTV client 10 of the Perlmann patent, whereas the pending application has a separate host machine and printer network board/box. Therefore, in light of this additional requirement, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) of claims 1-5 have been withdrawn, and replaced with a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

3. The rejections of claims 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Gase (US-PAT 5,580,177) are withdrawn as necessitated by the new requirement, “said printer network board/box performing,” added in the applicant’s amendment. These method claims are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

4. The argument requesting withdrawal of rejections of claims 21-23 has been found unconvincing by the examiner. Applicant states, “in claim 21, a printer is claimed that generates print data in accordance with information resources received from outside... Perlman is deficient with respect to disclosing a printer, and this is not made up by a reference to Kageyama, which merely shows a print server 14 including a server 15, print controller 16, and print engine 17, as shown in 2A.” Examiner asserts

Art Unit: 2622

Kageyama's invention includes a printer because it includes the functional components required by all printers, ie, a controller and print engine. Furthermore, Kageyama discloses in column 1, lines 44-51, "the printer controller 16 processes the received document data and gives an instruction for printing the document to the printer engine 17. Finally, the printer engine 17 carries out an electrophotographic printing process or a wire dot printing process according to the instruction output from the printer controller 16 to print the document on the sheets of paper." Therefore, Kageyama teaches "a printer." The request for withdrawal is respectfully denied.

Drawings

5. Examiner withdraws objection to drawings in light of explanation by Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claim 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Computer programs not patentable material as cited by the MPEP Chapter 2100:

"Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and Office personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable

medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material."

Examiner apologizes for this oversight, which should have been included on the first non-final rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlmann (US-PAT 6,269,481 B1).

With regards to claim 1, Perlman discloses in figure 1 a WebTV client 1 which is connected to the Internet 3 via modem pool 2 connected through network bus 29. The WebTV client qualifies as a "network device," as stated in the original claims, because it is a computing peripheral or computer communicably attached to a local or wide area network. Perlman discloses in column 6 lines 20-23, in figure 6, "in response to system initialization, the WebTV box 10 requests the device codes from all peripheral devices 30 connected in the daisy chain in step 601." Perlman also states "in step 604, the WebTV box 10 transmits all of the received device codes to the WebTV server 5 over the network connection 29." Perlman further explains "in step 606, the WebTV server 5 automatically downloads these device drivers to the WebTV client 1 over the network connection 29. In step 607, the WebTV box 10 receives and automatically installs the

device drivers from the WebTV server 5.” With regards to the peripherals 30, Perlman states in column 1, lines 26-33, “typical peripheral devices that may be used in such a system include keyboards, pointing devices, monitors, printers, mass storage devices, and audio or visual input/output devices. Generally, for any particular peripheral device, the main computer must be programmed with special software that permits the main computer to communicate with the peripheral device--this software is often referred to as the device driver for the peripheral device.” Therefore, the first limitation of claim 1 is met, since the network device, the WebTV host 10, acquires “print related information necessary for generating print data” as stated in the application disclosure “from a prescribed location on the network at a prescribed time.”

Perlmann does not disclose “a network board/box,” as is required by the amended claims. Furthermore, Perlmann’s invention provides “a hosting function,” which, as stated in the amendments by the Applicant, is separate from the network board/box.

Printer servers were well known in the art at the time of invention (Official notice). They accept raw (not raster information processed) text and image data from a client or host pc, then utilize one of a plurality of printer drivers currently installed in the server to convert the raw data into a data format usable by a specific printer.

Perlmann is combinable with a commonly known printer server because both inventions pertain to storing and utilizing driver files for specific peripherals.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a method of updating the printer drivers in a print server as taught by Perlmann.

The motivation of this modification would be to provide a printer server which is able to automatically update its installed printer drivers upon powering up the machine.

Thus it would have been obvious to combine Perlmann with a commonly known printer server to obtain the invention as disclosed in claim 1.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Perlman states in column 6, lines 59-62, "once the appropriate drivers are identified, in step 606 the WebTV server 5 automatically downloads these device drivers to the WebTV client 1 over the network connection 29." Therefore, the "said information resources are appropriately acquired from a prescribed location on the network." Because Perlman does not specifically detail the printer operation, examiner asserts that the utilization of a printer as a peripheral inherently requires print data sent from the device driver in the following industry-accepted formats: image data, text data, or intermediate data. Therefore claim 3 is anticipated by Perlman's system as well as every printer communicably attached to a host PC, server, or network device.

In regards to claim 4, Perlman discloses in column 5, lines 34-35, a method of automatically identifying and installing device drivers for peripherals "at system initialization (i.e., upon power-up or in response to a reset command.)" Thus the prescribed time as disclosed in the rejection for claim 2 is either when the said printer is turned on [or] upon receipt of instructions from a user." Broadly defined, the system power-up process includes all peripheral devices, and thus the method disclosed by Perlman automatically begins upon initialization of the printer. Additionally, broadly

defined, a reset command as disclosed by Perlman qualifies as an instruction from the user, thus the patented system begins its automatic identification and driver download process "upon receipt of instructions from a user."

Regarding claim 5, Perlman discloses in column 7, lines 7-8, "a method and apparatus for automatically installing appropriate device drivers for all peripheral devices connected to a host processing system over a network." Again stating column 6, lines 59-62 of Perlman's patent, the system "in step 606 the WebTV server 5 automatically downloads these device drivers to the WebTV client 1 over the network connection 29." Therefore the print related information comprises "at least a color version table, printer driver program, font data, or font renderer program"

10. Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlmann (US-PAT 6,269,481 B1) in view of Gase (US-PAT 5,580,177)

The printer server with automatic updates as disclosed by Perlmann is disclosed in the rejection for claim 1.

The Perlmann-modified print server (qualifying as a printer network board/box) does not disclose "a step for judging whether or not print related information should be acquired at a prescribed time," as required by claim 34, nor does it disclose "a location information distribution server comprising a database for storing location information on the network concerning print related information which is used to generate the print data, and characterized in that upon inquiry of location information of print related information, the corresponding location information is extracted in reference to said

database, and sent." In fact, Perlmann does not disclose any interactions on the server side of the automatic driver installation program claimed in his application.

Gase discloses a method of information processing wherein a file server 16 contains "memory for storing a most updated printer driver procedure for each printer type coupled to the file server." Flowchart 3a diagrams the process flow in which Gase's method acquires "print related information." Upon user input to print a document, the print utility in networked clients 10-14 requests a print job in step 70. Upon selection of a printer in step 74, the file server compares printer driver in the client machine with the file server stored printer driver. Gase further describes this judgement in column 5, lines 13-22, stating, "because memory 34 stores (i) most updated versions of printer drivers in printer/driver library 38 (ii) printer administration utility 28 and (iii) printer utility 24, there always exists a repository where the most updated version of a program can be found. Thus, when a client processor elects to utilize a particular printer, it further determines whether its printer driver 26 is consistent with the most updated printer driver version in printer driver library 38. If not, the client processor causes its printer driver 26 to be revised or overwritten to reflect the most updated printer/driver version contained within printer driver library 38."

Gase and Perlmann are combinable with a common print server because they all deal with a centrally located server for storing and running device drivers, specifically for printing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of normal skill in the art to replace include in the Perlmann-modified print server a judgement algorithm as shown in the File Server 16 of Gase's invention.

The motivation of this modification would be to allow the Printer Network Board/Box to accurately determine whether the existing printer drivers should be updated so that the drivers are not updated every time the device powers on as suggested by Perlmann.

Thus it would have been obvious to combine the Perlmann-modified print server with Gase to obtain the invention as disclosed in claim 34, as well as the method encoded on a computer readable medium as disclosed in claim 35.

11. Claims 21, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman (US-PAT 6269481) in view of Kageyama (US-PAT 5303336).

With regards to claim 21, With regards to claim 1, Perlman discloses in figure 1 a WebTV client 1 which is connected to the Internet 3 via modem pool 2 connected through network bus 29. The WebTV client qualifies as a "network device" because it is a computing peripheral or computer communicably attached to a local or wide area network. Perlman discloses in column 6 lines 20-23, in figure 6, "in response to system initialization, the WebTV box 10 requests the device codes from all peripheral devices 30 connected in the daisy chain in step 601." Perlman also states "in step 604, the WebTV box 10 transmits all of the received device codes to the WebTV server6 over

the network connection 29.” Perlman further explains “in step 606, the WebTV server 5 automatically downloads these device drivers to the WebTV client 1 over the network connection 29. In step 607, the WebTV box 10 receives and automatically installs the device drivers from the WebTV server 5.” With regards to the peripherals 30, Perlman states in column 1, lines 26-33, “typical peripheral devices that may be used in such a system include keyboards, pointing devices, monitors, printers, mass storage devices, and audio or visual input/output devices. Generally, for any particular peripheral device, the main computer must be programmed with special software that permits the main computer to communicate with the peripheral device--this software is often referred to as the device driver for the peripheral device.” Therefore, the first limitation of claim 21 is met, since the network device, the WebTV host 10, acquires “print related information necessary for generating print data” as stated in the application disclosure “from a prescribed location on the network at a prescribed time.”

Perlman shows in figure 5 the WebTV box 10 communicably attached via data bus 28 to peripherals 30. In the specific case of utilizing a printer as a peripheral 30, print data converted from text or images to a printer-recognizable format via the printer driver downloaded and installed in WebTV host 10 is transmitted to the printer via bus 28. Therefore, the patented invention meets the limitation “said print data is generated by using said acquired print related information, and sent to said printer.”

Perlman does not disclose a printer wherein the network device (either a host machine or a print server) is physically integrated within the printer enclosure.

Kageyama discloses in figure 2a a print server 14 with the server 15, controller 16, and printer engine 17 encapsulated within the same physical device. A more detailed depiction of the server 14's internals is shown in figure 2b. The server includes a terminal communication port 150 which allows it to receive print data from clients 11-13 via network 10.

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of normal skill in the art to combine in Perlman's automatic printer device driver installation system the network device with the printer in a common physical enclosure as taught by Kageyama.

The two are combinable because they both are both from the field of peripheral management and communication.

The motivation behind this combination would be to reduce the amount of user interaction in the installation of software by including the printer device driver within the printer, in effect removing the tedious step of installing printer device drivers on each host machine to utilize a given printer.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Perlman and Kageyama to produce the invention as claimed in claim 21. Note for all further rejections under 35 USC 103, the aforementioned Perlman as modified by Kageyama combination is used.

With regards to claim 22, Perlman discloses in column 5, lines 34-35, a method of automatically identifying and installing device drivers for peripherals "at system initialization (i.e., upon power-up or in response to a reset command.)" Thus the

prescribed time as disclosed in the rejection for claim 2 is either when the said printer is turned on [or] upon receipt of instructions from a user.” Broadly defined, the system power-up process includes all peripheral devices, and thus the method disclosed by Perlman automatically begins upon initialization of the printer. Additionally, broadly defined, a reset command as disclosed by Perlman qualifies as an instruction from the user, thus the patented system begins its automatic identification and driver download process “upon receipt of instructions from a user.”

Perlman does not disclose a printer wherein the network device (either a host machine or a print server) is physically integrated within the printer enclosure.

Kageyama discloses in figure 2a a print server 14 with the server 15, controller 16, and printer engine 17 encapsulated within the same physical device. A more detailed depiction of the server 14's internals is shown in figure 2b. The server includes a terminal communication port 150 which allows it to receive print data from clients 11-13 via network 10.

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of normal skill in the art to combine in Perlman's automatic printer device driver installation system the network device with the printer in a common physical enclosure as taught by Kageyama.

The two are combinable because they both are both from the field of peripheral management and communication.

The motivation behind this combination would be to reduce the amount of user interaction in the installation of software by including the printer device driver within the

printer, in effect removing the tedious step of installing printer device drivers on each host machine to utilize a given printer.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Perlman and Kageyama to produce the invention as claimed in claim 22.

With regards to claim 23, the Kageyama modified Perlman system as thoroughly described above comprises "a method and apparatus for automatically installing appropriate device drivers for all peripheral devices connected to a host processing system over a network." Again stating column 6, lines 59-62 of Perlman's patent, the system "in step 606 the WebTV server 5 automatically downloads these device drivers to the WebTV client 1 over the network connection 29." Therefore the print related information comprises "at least a color version table, printer driver program, font data, or font renderer program"

12. Claims 11-19, and 24-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman (US-PAT 6269481) in view of Kageyama (US-PAT 5303336) further in view of Gase (US-PAT 5580177).

With regards to claims 11 and 24, Gase states in column 4, lines 38-44, "each modular I/O card 30 periodically 'advertises its availability by the transmission of messages to file server 16. Each message includes the name of the service, the type of the service, and the address of the available service. This data is accumulated within

file server 16 and enables the generation of display presentation 60 at a client processor. Display screen presentation 50 appears on a client processor in response to a user's request to show available printers." The host queries the server in reference to available printers according to the installed device driver on the printer, and the server collects this address and status information from the multiple printer transmissions stored in a database and relays the information back to the host." Broadly defined, this qualifies as "an inquiry of location information of print related information, the corresponding location information is extracted in reference to said database and sent." Because the Perlman-Kageyama combination includes the network device within the printer enclosure, the addition of the Gase method to the aforementioned combination meets both the limitations for claim 11, the network device, and claim 24, the printer.

Regarding claims 12 and 25, the Perlman-Kageyama combination as exhaustively described above anticipates a printer with an integrated network device/print server, which is capable of acquiring printer device drivers from a prescribed time and location and generating print data using the device driving and printing the document. For more detail regarding this combination please refer back to the detailed description in the previous rejections.

The aforementioned Perlman-Kageyama invention does not perform a judgement to determine whether the driver contained in the printer is different from the driver in the server, nor does it re-download the driver in the event that the judgement is positive.

Gase discloses a method of information processing wherein a file server, analogous to the WebTV server 5 as disclosed by Perlman, 16 contains "memory for storing a most updated printer driver procedure for each printer type coupled to the file server." Flowchart 3a diagrams the process flow in which Gase's method acquires "print related information." Upon user input to print a document, the print utility in networked clients 10-14 requests a print job in step 70. Upon selection of a printer in step 74, the file server compares printer driver in the client machine (analogous to the printer with included client machine) with the file server stored printer driver. Gase further describes this judgement in column 5, lines 13-22, stating, "because memory 34 stores (i) most updated versions of printer drivers in printer/driver library 38 (ii) printer administration utility 28 and (iii) printer utility 24, there always exists a repository where the most updated version of a program can be found. Thus, when a client processor elects to utilize a particular printer, it further determines whether its printer driver 26 is consistent with the most updated printer driver version in printer driver library 38. If not, the client processor causes its printer driver 26 to be revised or overwritten to reflect the most updated printer/driver version contained within printer driver library 38."

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of normal skill in the art to include in the aforementioned Perlman-Kageyama combination a comparison and judgement operation as taught by Gase.

The three are combinable because they are all from the field of peripheral setup and communication; in particular, Perlman and Gase deal specifically with automatic

device driver installation, while Kageyama and Gase deal specifically with print server automation.

The motivation behind this modification would be to automatically and seamlessly ensure that the most up to date printer device driver is installed on the printer's device driver memory.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the Perlman-Kageyama combination with the Gase method to obtain the invention disclosed in claims 12 and 25.

With regards to claims 14 and 27, the judgement as described by the preceding claim rejection of 12 and 25 denotes that "the client processor causes its printer driver 26 to be revised or overwritten to reflect the most updated printer/driver version contained within printer driver library 38." Since in the aforementioned Perlman-Kageyama combination the client processor/network device is integral to the printer, this judgement is "made by the printer [or network device] itself."

Regarding claims 16 and 29, the aforementioned Perlman-Kageyama printer is on the network connected to the device driver server. Therefore, the printer comprises "a prescribed location on the network." Broadly defined, the Perlman-Kageyama printer is characterized in that "said judgement is made at a prescribed location on said network."

In regards to claims 13 and 26, the method as disclosed by Gase involves the “client processor caus[ing] its printer driver 26 to be revised or overwritten to reflect the most updated printer/driver version contained within printer driver library 38.”

“Overwriting” memory is an identical process to “replacing” memory. Therefore, if the client device driver does not match the server’s device driver, it is required to be replaced by the client processor.

With regards to claims 15 and 28, the judgement as described by the preceding claim rejection of 12 and 25 denotes that “the client processor causes its printer driver 26 to be revised or overwritten to reflect the most updated printer/driver version contained within printer driver library 38.” Since in the aforementioned Perlman-Kageyama combination the client processor/network device is integral to the printer, this judgement is “made by the printer [or network device] itself.”

Regarding claims 17 and 30, the aforementioned Perlman-Kageyama printer is on the network connected to the device driver server. Therefore, the printer comprises “a prescribed location on the network.” Broadly defined, the Perlman-Kageyama printer is characterized in that “said judgement is made at a prescribed location on said network.”

With regards to claims 18 and 31, Gase’s disclosed method keeps the installed device driver in the memory of the client processor for use until the client processor detects a difference between the client device driver and the updated server device driver. Since in the aforementioned Perlman-Kageyama combination the client

processor/network device is integral to the printer, the "print related information acquired from a prescribed location on said network is retained in said printer [or network device], and said print related information is held to be available until it is deleted."

Regarding claims 19 and 32, Gase's disclosed method keeps the installed device driver in the memory of the client processor for use until the client processor detects a difference between the client device driver and the updated server device driver. The overwriting process is functionally identical to a delete process, since the "precedeing print related information" is no longer stored in the said memory location after the overwriting. Since in the aforementioned Perlman-Kageyama combination the client processor/network device is integral to the printer, the "said printer [or network device] comprises preceding print related information corresponding to said print related information which is acquired, said preceding print related information is deleted."

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 6-10, 20, 33, and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yacoub (US-PAT 6452692) discloses a networked print server for automatically selecting print locations, wherein the print server keeps all the driver

files updated and the host machines only have a virtual printer installed, as is the standard in the industry. Agatone (US-PAT 5852744) discloses a method for automatically discovering a network printer wherein a central network server is responsible for device driver storage and updating.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert N. Kang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0593. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571)272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RNK



TWYLLER LAMB
PRIMARY EXAMINER